testimony 1ac:

I value morality. To determine the right answer to any question, first we consider what would make an answer right; second the best way to determine the right answer. Studying calculus may help understand what makes one answer correct; plugging the question into Mathematica may be more likely to get me the correct answer. Medical research may give me the tools to know what my symptoms mean; consulting a doctor is still more reliable to diagnose the illness.

This is distinction between analytic and regulative epistemology. Analytic seeks to enumerate those conditions by which one can be said to have satisfied the reductive criteria of knowledge. Regulative epistemology recognizes the plurality of epistemic projects and devotes itself to how we should practically make decisions. It is a question of intellectual virtues, skills one should inculcate should they think well. **WOODS AND ROBERTS**[[1]](#footnote-1)**:** The triviality of standard epistemology’s examples is due in part to the historical preoccupation with skepticism.If one cannot secure so simple a claim as “ I have two hands” or “ The world has existed for quite a while” against the mischief of evil demons and manipulative brain scientists, it makes little sense to worry about how we know difficult truths about the causes of the Second World War or the structure of DNA. Anti-skeptical maneuvers are a strong motif in the history of philosophy: Plato opposes the Sophists, Augustine the academic skeptics, Descartes Montaigne, Reid Hume, and Moore and Wittgenstein set themselves against skepticism inspired by Russell. However dominant anti-skepticism may be historically, some of epistemology’s most productive moments— in Aquinas, Kant, Plantinga— arose because philosophers were willing to set aside skeptical worries and look into what ordinary practitioners of science, religion, politics, and humanistic inquiry were willing to call knowledge. Intellectual virtues of the kind that interest Zagzebski and us seem likely to have relevance to high-end kinds of knowledge like scientific discoveries, the subtle understanding of difficult texts, moral self-knowledge, and knowledge of God, while being marginal to knowing, upon taking a look, that a bird is outside my window, or that what is in front of me is white paper. Given the central place of knowledge and understanding in human life, one would expect epistemology to be one of the most fascinating and enriching fields of philosophy and itself an important part of an education for life. We might expect that any bright university student who got all the way to her junior year without dipping her mind in an epistemology course would have to hang her head in shame of her cultural poverty. But the character and preoccupations of much of the epistemology of the twentieth century disappoint this expectation. We think that the new emphasis on the virtues and their relation to epistemic goods has the potential to put epistemology in its rightful place. And we hope that the present book, whatever its many shortcomings in detail, will suggest the rich ways in which epistemology-—the study of knowledge and related human goods— connects with ethical and political issues, with the practice of science and other forms of inquiry, with religion and spirituality, with appreciation of the arts, and with the enterprise of education. [They continue] Nicholas Wolterstorff distinguishes two kinds of epistemology, which he calls “analytic” and “regulative” . Analytic epistemology aims to produce theories of knowledge, rationality, warrant, justification, and so forth, and proceeds by attempting to define these terms. The English-speaking epistemology of the twentieth century is chiefly of this kind, and all of the virtue epistemologies of the last twenty-five years have been attempts to turn the intellectual virtues to the purposes of analytic epistemology. Regulative epistemology, which is the kind mostly practiced by Locke and Descartes and others of their period, does not aim to produce a theory of knowledge (though something like classical foundationalism does get produced as a by-product by Locke and Descartes). Instead**, it** tries to generate guidance for epistemic practice, “ how we ought to conduct our understandings, what we ought to do by way of forming beliefs” (p. xvi). Regulative epistemology is a response to perceived deficiencies in people’s epistemic conduct, and thus is strongly practical and social, rather than just an interesting theoretical challenge for philosophy professors and smart students. This kind of epistemology aims to change the (social) world. According to Wolterstorff, Locke’s regulative epistemology was a response to the social and intellectual crisis created by the breakup of medieval Christendom’s intellectual consensus. As Locke and others saw it, people’s intellectual lives needed to be reformed-— based on reason, rather than tradition or passions— because only thus could disagreements about the most fundamental issues, along with the resulting social conflicts, be resolved. But Locke also saw the need for reformation as perennial and genetically human: “I think there are a great many natural defects in the understanding capable of amendment.” Since “we are all short sighted” , seeing things from our own particular angle and not possessing comprehensive faculties, we need to learn the habit and inclination to consult others whose opinions differ from our own and read outside our discipline.21 In effect, Wolterstorff distinguishes two kinds of regulative epistemology, a rule-oriented kind and a habit-oriented kind (see pp. 152—4). Rule oriented epistemology, exemplified by Descartes’s Discourse on Method and Rules for the Direction of the Mind, provides procedural directions for acquiring knowledge, avoiding error, and conducting oneself rationally.22 By contrast, Locke’s regulative epistemology, as exemplified in Book IV of Ills Essay Concerning Human Understanding and Of the Conduct of the Understanding, aims less at the direct regulation of epistemic conduct than at the description of the habits of mind of the epistemicaily rational person. As Locke comments, Nobody is made anything by hearing of rules, or laying them up in his memory... and you may as well hope to make a good painter or musician, extempore, by a lecture and instruction in the arts of music and painting**,** as a coherent thinker, or a strict reasoner, by a set of rules**,** showing **him** wherein right reasoning consists. (Conduct, §4, p. 175) We need not rule-books, but a training that nurtures people in the right intellectual dispositions. Wolterstorff emphasizes that Locke focuses not on the belief-producing mechanisms or faculties that are native to the human mind, but instead on the ways in which such natural faculties are employed in more complex intellectual practices, which have a social dimension and are culturally shaped. Locke aims to reform that culture, to reshape the practices, and thus to foster in his contemporaries habits that support the reshaped practices. It is implicit in Locke’s discussions, and often explicit as well, that the habits in question are not mere habits, but virtues. Many habits are nothing more than skills— expertise in plying methods and techniques— but the habits that Locke describes are in many cases “ habits of the heart” , determinate dispositional states of concern, desire, and pleasure and pain, rather than mere habituated aptitudes. We will return to Locke when we take up the topic of intellectual practices in Chapter 5 The virtues epistemology of this book is a return to this tradition of the seventeenth century, to a regulative epistemology which, like Locke’s, describes the personal dispositions of the agent rather than providing direct rules o f epistemic action. It focuses on forming the practitioner’s character and is strongly education-oriented. The stress on intellectual virtues that has arisen among us is a start that can be felicitously developed in the regulative direction. Like Locke’s, our book is a response to a perception of deficiency in the epistemic agents of our time. But it is not a response to any particular historical upheaval or social crisis. We see a perennial set of deficiencies which in every generation need to be corrected, and a perennial positive need for formation in dispositions o f intellectual excellence. Our response to pluralism of belief systems differs from that of Locke and his fellow promoters of the life of “ reason” . Our regulative epistemology does not aim at quieting fundamental disagreement. Virtues presuppose one or another particular metaphysical or world-view background, and the prospect of securing universal agreement about that is dim. However, several of the virtues that we will discuss in Part II broaden minds and civilize intellectual exchange. The formation of excellent intellectual agents is clearly the business of schools and parents. They are the chief educators of character. But Locke and Descartes think that philosophers have a role as well, and we agree. What is that role, and how does it work? How do philosophers contribute to the regulation of intellectual character? The role that we picture for ourselves both resembles and diverges from the one that epistemologists in the twentieth century implicitly accepted for themselves.

Thus any educational activity should pursue intellectual virtues. Virtues, such as humility, require one to recognize cognitive limitations and epistemic authority of experts. We need to learn what authorities to trust, not to move away from trust in authorities. **WOODS AND ROBERTS (2):** Thomas Reid pointed out that we humans tend to believe what we’re told. He considered this tendency “a good gift of Nature”, and the goodness he had in mind was in the first instance epistemic. Because the intellectual life is profoundly cooperative, this **gift** is important **to us.** It is a faculty, not something to suppress, eradicate, or bypass, but something to refine and develop, because we depend, and must depend, heavily on the unsupported testimony of others. Without this natural tendency, children could not get started in their cognitive lives, nor could adults come close to collecting all the truths they need to function **well** intellectually. [They Continue] The threat posed by **an** undisciplined credulity **disposition** is gullibility, but in some intellectual ambiences a wholesale fastidiousness about belief formation may be the problem. Plantinga’s discussion of testimony is less polemical than his discussion of self-knowledge, but it might have been directed against a tendency suggested by some of the writings of Descartes, Locke, and Kant. These epistemologists are suspicious of testimony because it seems to compromise the principle that each person should be responsible for his own cognitions and because testimony may seem to be a generally low-grade kind of evidence. But, given natural human limitations, and the way things go according to the human cognitive design plan, the earlymodern tendency to prescribe a general suspicion of tradition and testimony could be **read as** an endorsement of epistemic arrogance and fastidiousness an insistence on the right and duty always to “see for oneself” . A character that made us generally suspicious of testimony or overly insistent on having in our own possession all the evidence supporting each of our beliefs, would be a paralyzing intellectual paranoia, a hyperindividualism that would be both unrealistic and, to the extent that it actually got instantiated as a personality trait, detrimental to our cognitive functioning. The virtues of intellectual humility and gratitude could be regarded as a liberation of the credulity disposition from unwarranted intellectual suspicion and distrust, and thus as dispositions promoting warrant in testimony circumstances.

The standard is **appealing to qualified moral authorities**. While a reductive account of authority is impossible given the fwk warrants, a heuristic is those who demonstrated moral clarity at times of confusion, those who did what virtuous while society accepts moral failure.

To clarify:

1) epistemology – the best way to conform to the true moral principle is through testimony. Listening to doctors doesn’t make you healthier, but one is most likely to take healthy actions if they listen to their doctor. Alternative principles are not competitive. The principle might be true, but the NC reasoning was already considered by AC experts. Standards do not act as counter evidence, any more than anecdotes can be counter evidence to a study.

2) Testimony inescapable – You accept testimony of your authors in descriptions of the world. The judge accepts your testimony in believing your claims about authors. We accepted the testimony of the tournament about where to be when to debate. We cannot reason without accepting testimonial authority to provide reasonable assumptions.

3) The framework recognizes epistemic limitations and competitive incentives mean that the authorities can assess the complexities of oppression and the methods to address it. People who experience oppression and dedicated their lives to fighting it will be much better at recognizing it. We should consider diverse perspectives, but just as I rely on my math friends to synthesize math debates I use experts to synthesize the opinions of others in an inclusive way. They will be far more charitable than I would.

Prefer the standard:

1. We cannot wait till we have the right ethical method, otherwise we could not even be confident that studying ethics is ethical. Instead we must recognize authority of those better situated in moral understanding. **GADAMER[[2]](#footnote-2):** The Enlightenment's distinction between faith in authority and using one's own reason is, in itself, legitimate. If the prestige of authority displaces one's own judgment, then authority is in fact a source of prejudices. But this does not preclude its being a source of truth, and that is what the Enlightenment failed to see when it denigrated all authority. To be convinced of this, we need only consider one of the greatest forerunners of the European Enlightenment, namely Descartes. Despite the radicalness of his methodological thinking, we know that Descartes excluded morality from the total reconstruction of all truths by reason. This was what he meant by his provisional morality. It seems to me symptomatic that he did not in fact elaborate his definitive morality and that its principles, as far as we can judge from his letters to Elizabeth, contain hardly anything new. It is obviously unthinkable to defer morality until modern science has progressed enough to provide a new basis for it. In fact the denigration of authority is not the only prejudice established by the Enlightenment. It also distorted the very concept of authority. Based on the Enlightenment conception of reason and freedom, the concept of authority could be viewed as diametrically opposed to reason and freedom: to be, in fact, blind obedience. This is the meaning that we find in the language critical of modern dictatorships. But this is not the essence of authority. Admittedly, it is primarily persons that have authority; but the authority of persons is ultimately based not on the subjection and abdication of reason but on an act of acknowledgment and knowledge—the knowledge, namely, that the other is superior to oneself in judgment and insight and that for this reason his judgment takes precedence—i.e., it has priority over one's own. This is connected with the fact that authority cannot actually be bestowed but is earned, and must be earned if someone is to lay claim to it. It rests on acknowledgment and hence on an act of reason itself which, aware of its own limitations, trusts to the better insight of others. Authority in this sense, properly understood, has nothing to do with blind obedience to commands. Indeed, authority has to do not with obedience but rather with knowledge. It is true that authority implies the capacity to command and be obeyed. But this proceeds only from the authority that a person has. Even the anonymous and impersonal authority of a superior which derives from his office is not ultimately based on this hierarchy, but is what makes it possible. Here also its true basis is an act of freedom and reason that grants the authority of a superior fundamentally because he has a wider view of things or is better informed—i.e., once again, because he knows more.22 Thus, acknowledging authority is always connected with the idea that what the authority says is not irrational and arbitrary but can, in principle, be discovered to be true. This is the essence of the authority claimed by the teacher, the superior, the expert. The prejudices that they implant are legitimized by the person who presents them. But in this way they become prejudices not just in favor of a person but a content, since they effect the same disposition to believe something that can be brought about in other ways—e.g., by good reasons. Thus the essence of authority belongs in the context of a theory of prejudices free from the extremism of the Enlightenment. Here we can find support in the romantic criticism of the Enlightenment; for there is one form of authority particularly defended by romanticism, namely tradition. That which has been sanctioned by tradition and custom has an authority that is nameless, and our finite historical being is marked by the fact that the authority of what has been handed down to us—and not just what is clearly grounded—always has power over our attitudes and behavior. All education depends on this, and even though, in the case of education, the educator loses his function when his charge comes of age and sets his own insight and decisions in the place of the authority of the educator, becoming mature does not mean that a person becomes his own master in the sense that he is freed from all tradition. The real force of morals, for example, is based on tradition. They are freely taken over but by no means created by a free insight or grounded on reasons. This is precisely what we call tradition: the ground of their validity. And in fact it is to romanticism that we owe this correction of the Enlightenment: that tradition has a justification that lies beyond rational grounding and in large measure determines our institutions and attitudes. What makes classical ethics superior to modern moral philosophy is that it grounds the transition from ethics to "politics," the art of right legislation, on the indispensability of tradition.

2. It is impossible to derive obligation through academic reflection. **First,** development of all such academic frameworks presuppose prior values which were not yet been derived, like the value of truth or the good of scholarship. **Second**, one cannot derive ethics from something non-ethical, because you would have to either a) presuppose the proper way to make the derivation which smuggles in a hidden non-derived moral premise or b) it would simply end up describing the way the world is, not the way it ought to be. **READER[[3]](#footnote-3):** What is the alternative? To understand ethics in its own terms. This deprives us of explanatory naturalism. We can't without error expect to understand ethics in any terms but ethical. This has seemed to many philosophers to be unduly restrictive, and to threaten relativism.8 But in fact it does not lead to these difficulties ? or, more accurately, it doesn't exac erbate them. The problem of displaying the rationality of ethics in a com pelling way is real. But it is also general. It is the same as the problem of displaying the rationality of all the other things we do: playing games, conducting scientific enquiry, writing philosophy papers. We might be able to make connections between activities using an analogy with another game, say, to illuminate the game of chess for someone. But all we will ever be able to lay our hands on in the activity of explaining, is more of the same: parts of our life. The idea of our being able to use 'the world as it is in itself to explain any of our activities is practically contradictory. And the idea that rationality supernature, rather than first nature can be used to explain ethics in this way, involves a similar error. The way we think acquire beliefs, deliberate, justify ourselves is also part of our life. It is as 'fundamental' in that life as ethics is, but no more so, no more knowable 'in itself, as Aristotle, in the grip of a similar error to our own, would have put it, than it is 'to us', here and now, living as we live. So explanatory accounts of ethics, whether they invoke first-nature or super natural reason, are mistaken. Explicatory naturalism is as far as we can go. And as far as we need to go.

*For example, the fact that I have an impulse cannot provide moral reason unless we already attach a normative precept – like that I ought to listen to the impulse for some reason. Or we would just end up recording the intensity of the feeling, which would be descriptive.*

Given that ethics is presupposed, those who have demonstrated it via ethical excellence direct us to normative conclusion. **LEWIS [Bracketed for Gender][[4]](#footnote-4):** Does this mean, then, that no progress in our perceptions of value can ever take place? That we are bound down for ever to an unchanging code given once for all? And is it, in any event, possible to talk of obeying what I call the Tao? If we lump together, as I have done, the traditional moralities of East and West, the Christian, the Pagan, and the Jew, shall we not find many contradictions and some absurdities? I admit all this. Some criticism, some removal of contradictions, even some real development, is required. But there are two very different kinds of criticism[s]. A theorist about language may approach [their] native tongue, as it were from outside, regarding its genius as a thing that has no claim on him and advocating wholesale alterations of its idiom and spelling in the interests of commercial convenience or scientific accuracy. That is one thing. A great poet, who has 'loved, and been well nurtured in [their] his mother tongue', may also make great alterations in it, but [their] his changes of the language are made in the spirit of the language itself: [they] works from within. The language which suffers, has also inspired the changes. That is a different thing—as different as the works of Shakespeare are from Basic English. It is the difference between alteration from within and alteration from without: between the organic and the surgical. In the same way, the Tao admits development from within. There is a difference between a real moral advance and a mere innovation. From the Confucian 'Do not do to others what you would not like them to do to you' to the Christian 'Do as you would be done by' is a real advance. The morality of Nietzsche is a mere innovation. The first is an advance because no one who did not admit the validity of the old maxim could see reason for accepting the new one, and anyone who accepted the old would at once recognize the new as an extension of the same principle. If he rejected it, he would have to reject it as a superfluity, something that went too far, not as something simply heterogeneous from his own ideas of value. But the Nietzschean ethic can be accepted only if we are ready to scrap traditional morals as a mere error and then to put ourselves in a position where we can find no ground for any value judgements at all. It is the difference between a man who says to us: 'You like your vegetables moderately fresh; why not grow your own and have them perfectly fresh?' and a man who says, 'Throw away that loaf and try eating bricks and centipedes instead.' Those who understand the spirit of the Tao and who have been led by that spirit can modify it in directions, which that spirit itself demands. Only they can know what those directions are. The outsider knows nothing about the matter. His attempts at alteration, as we have seen, contradict themselves. So far from being able to harmonize discrepancies in its letter by penetration to its spirit, he merely snatches at some one precept, on which the accidents of time and place happen to have riveted his attention, and then rides it to death—for no reason that he can give. From within the Tao itself comes the only authority to modify the Tao. This is what Confucius meant when he said 'With those who follow a different Way it is useless to take counsel'.5 This is why Aristotle said that only those who have been well brought up can usefully study ethics: to the corrupted man, the man who stands outside the Tao, the very starting point of this science is invisible.6 He may be hostile, but he cannot be critical: he does not know what is being discussed. This is why it was also said 'This people that knoweth not the Law is accursed'7 and 'He that believeth not shall be damned'.8 An open mind, in questions that are not ultimate, is useful. But an open mind about the ultimate foundations either of Theoretical or of Practical Reason is idiocy. If a man's mind is open on these things, let his mouth at least be shut. He can say nothing to the purpose. Outside the Tao there is no ground for criticizing either the Tao or anything else. In particular instances it may, no doubt, be a matter of some delicacy to decide where the legitimate internal criticism ends and the fatal external kind begins. But wherever any precept of traditional morality is simply challenged to produce its credentials, as though the burden of proof lay on it, we have taken the wrong position. The legitimate reformer endeavours to show that the precept in question conflicts with some precept which its defenders allow to be more fundamental, or that it does not really embody the judgement of value it professes to embody. The direct frontal attack 'Why?'—'What good does it do?'—'Who said so?' is never permissible; not because it is harsh or offensive but because no values at all can justify themselves on that level. If you persist in that kind of trial you will destroy all values, and so destroy the bases of your own criticism as well as the thing criticized. You must not hold a pistol to the head of the Tao. Nor must we postpone obedience to a precept until its credentials have been examined. Only those who are practising the Tao will understand it. It is the well-nurtured man, the cuor gentil, and he alone, who can recognize Reason when it comes.9 It is Paul, the Pharisee, the man 'perfect as touching the Law' who learns where and how that Law was deficient.10 In order to avoid misunderstanding, I may add that though I myself am a Theist, and indeed a Christian, I am not here attempting any indirect argument for Theism. I am simply arguing that if we are to have values at all we must accept the ultimate platitudes of Practical Reason as having absolute validity: that any attempt, having become sceptical about these, to reintroduce value lower down on some supposedly more 'realistic' basis, is doomed. Whether this position implies a supernatural origin for the Tao is a question I am not here concerned with.

*Next is the contention:*

The Pope occupies a unique position of authority. Few people are as carefully vetted morally as those given position over millions. The Pope has been chosen from a council of Cardinals who themselves gained positions through success as moral examples to others. All Popes reconcile academic and practical insights unlike those familiar only with the abstraction or particular. Popes are scholars but have to do a lot of social service. Pope Francis has presented examples to billions with acts of justice. **OBAMA**[[5]](#footnote-5)**:** Rare is the leader who makes us want to be better people. Pope Francis is such a leader. His Holiness has moved us with his message of inclusion, especially for the poor, the marginalized and the outcast. But it has been his deeds, his bearing, the gestures at once simple and profound — embracing the sick, ministering to the homeless, washing the feet of young prisoners — that have inspired us all. Pope Francis reminds us in ways that words alone cannot that no matter our station in life, we are bound by moral obligations to one another. His example challenges us to live out those obligations through work — to alleviate poverty, reduce inequality and promote peace; to feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, care for the sick and open new doors of opportunity and visions of possibility for everyone. His message of love and inclusion, his regard for “the least of these,” distills the essence of Jesus’ teachings and is a tonic for a cynical age. May we heed his humble example.

He affirms. **CAMPBELL AND LIVINGSTON**[[6]](#footnote-6)**:** During the civil rights era, Martin Luther King Jr. reminded us that there is a higher moral law of justice that people of conscience must follow. Today, Pope Francis reminds us that “money must serve, not rule” and that a moral economic system should “set about providing each inhabitant of the planet with the minimum wherewithal to live in dignity and freedom, with the possibility of supporting a family, educating children, praising God and developing one’s own human potential.” Ultimately, our faith compels us to be in solidarity with people who suffer at the margins of our economy. The Christian Scriptures say that we will be judged for what we have done for those in poverty. Using this moral standard, Obama’s executive order is more than justified; it is required. We know this because we have marched with these workers as they went on strike as part of the Good Jobs Nation campaign, and we brought a group of these workers to meet with senior White House officials on several occasions. One of these workers was Robyn Law, a fast-food worker in the Pentagon, who went on strike because she struggles to support her disabled mother and young child on a salary of $8.75 an hour. Another worker was Melissa Roseboro, a grandmother who earns $8.43 an hour and relies on food stamps to put food on the table because she makes so little at her job at the McDonald’s inside the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. We commend the president for his compassionate response to the needs of Robyn, Melissa and their co-workers. By using the power of his pen to lift the minimum wage for federally contracted workers, Obama is affirming the dignity and worth of all working people. As the CEO of the federal government, he is also sending a powerful message to the CEOs of private corporations that they too must honor their workers with just wages. Let’s pray that these CEOs, as well as our Congress, follow the president’s example. Still more need to be done. As people of faith, we must continue our efforts to make sure the government uses its contracting clout to ensure corporations pay workers living wages and benefits, follow labor laws and give workers a seat at the table so they don’t have to go on strike to have their voices heard.

Frances Perkins supported living wages. **SPRAGUE**[[7]](#footnote-7)**:** During her two-decades-long career in New York State, first as an activist and then as a public official in the administrations ofGovernors Al Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Frances Perkins advocated for minimum wage and maximum hour laws governing employment. When, in February, 1933, President-elect Roosevelt asked Perkins to serve in his cabinet as Secretary of Labor, she outlined for him a set of policy priorities she would pursue: a 40-hour work week; a minimum wage; unemployment compensation; worker’s compensation; abolition of child labor; direct federal aid to the states for unemployment relief; Social Security; a revitalized federal employment service; and universal health insurance. Frances Perkins recognized the compassionate need to pay America’s workers a living wage, but also the connection between wages and the economic health of the country. In her first book in 1934, People at Work, she wrote: It was no new thing for America to refuse to let its people starve, nor was it a new idea that man should live by his own labor, but it had not been generally realized that on the ability of the common man to support himself hung the prosperity of everyone in the country. The President shared that viewpoint. In calling upon Congress in 1937 to consider his wage and hour legislation, as well as a prohibition against child labor, Roosevelt issued a message stating, “The exploitation of child labor and the undercutting of wages and the stretching of the hours of the poorest paid workers in periods of business recession has a serious effect on buying power.” The Fair Labor Standards Act, enacted in 1938, was the last major legislation of the New Deal. It prohibited child labor and established statutory minimum wages and maximum hours and fulfilled, at last, Perkins’ goals of nationwide protections for workers engaged in interstate commerce. The Act set the minimum wage in 1938 at $.25/hour, to be increased in seven years to $.40/hour, with a forty-four hour work week, decreasing to forty hours in three years. A Wage and Hour Division was established within the Department of Labor to enforce the Act. In her book, The Roosevelt I Knew, published in 1946, Frances Perkins noted: At this writing, the law seems to be a permanent part of the legal structure and economic pattern of the United States.

Perkins guided by an incredible moral compass. **DOWNEY**[[8]](#footnote-8)**:** Book Description Frances Perkins is no longer a household name, yet she was one of the most influential women of the twentieth century. Based on eight years of research, extensive archival materials, new documents, and exclusive access to Perkins’s family members and friends, this biography is the first complete portrait of a devoted public servant with a passionate personal life, a mother who changed the landscape of American business and society. Frances Perkins was named Secretary of Labor by Franklin Roosevelt in 1933. As the first female cabinet secretary, she spearheaded the fight to improve the lives of America’s working people while juggling her own complex family responsibilities. Perkins’s ideas became the cornerstones of the most important social welfare and legislation in the nation’s history, including unemployment compensation, child labor laws, and the forty-hour work week. Arriving in Washington at the height of the Great Depression, Perkins pushed for massive public works projects that created millions of jobs for unemployed workers. She breathed life back into the nation’s labor movement, boosting living standards across the country. As head of the Immigration Service, she fought to bring European refugees to safety in the United States. Her greatest triumph was creating Social Security. Written with a wit that echoes Frances Perkins’s own, award-winning journalist Kirstin Downey gives us a riveting exploration of how and why Perkins slipped into historical oblivion, and restores Perkins to her proper place in history. Housing prices had been pumped up by crazy new kinds of loans, and foreclosures of homes and farms were surging as borrowers faltered under the payments. Companies had enjoyed record profits and ploughed the money into machinery designed to boost productivity, cutting their workforces. The unemployment rate skyrocketed. Companies slashed the wages of the remaining workers, and asked them to work longer and longer hours. And then Wall Street imploded as the stock market crashed. This was the scenario Franklin Delano Roosevelt faced as he entered the presidency in 1933. An era of rampant speculation had come to an end. A women stepped in to put things right. FDR turned to a long-time friend for guidance about how best to proceed, and asked her to join his Cabinet as Secretary of Labor. The middle-aged woman, a social worker named Frances Perkins, had spent a lifetime preparing for the job. She had studied economic boom and bust cycles, and knew they were a recurring pattern in modern industrial economies. She had a vision for how to blunt the worst of the hardship that American families were suffering, until business recovered again on its own. She proposed a system of unemployment insurance, so that when workers lost their jobs through no fault of their own, they would have some income to keep their families fed while they looked for new jobs. Senior citizens had lost their life savings as real estate values fell and the stock market tumbled, and they needed some sort of income support, some kind of social security, when they grew too old to work. Employed people were stumbling under long work hours. She advocated the creation of a 40-hour workweek and a minimum wage. Companies were hiring teenagers instead of adults to save money, and she thought the time was ripe to place new restrictions on child labor. “Nothing like this has ever been done in the United States before,” she told him. “You know that, don’t you?” Within weeks she would head to Washington, D.C. by his side. The challenges they would face would be great. The conservative Supreme Court, businessmen, free-market ideologues and even some labor leaders would oppose them. They would try to block her work. They would argue that the poor should be left to fend for themselves. They would savage Frances’s reputation, they would eventually try to impeach her. But she would not give up. Frances Perkins, the first woman to take a position in the top tier of federal government, would succeed. The institutions she created would help future generations cope with the recurring economic downturns that she had predicted would come again. Her extraordinary achievements make her one of the most influential women of the twentieth century, one whose legacy should be widely celebrated.

Thomas Perez is moral inspiration who has fought against injustice. **CORN:**[[9]](#footnote-9) Whether or not the Democrats lose their Senate majority on Tuesday, President Barack Obama will need to show some fight after the midterm elections. If the Republicans triumph, Obama must do something to rally his discouraged supporters and show he won't spend his final two years as a truly lame-duck president. If the Dems manage to hold the Senate, the president, who has been pinned down by ISIS, Ebola, and other crises, will still be looking for a way to take back the political narrative and flex his political and policy muscle. Either way, he has a good option: nominate Tom Perez as attorney general. The chatter in Washington is that Obama will announce his pick to replace the outgoing Eric Holder soon after Election Day, and Perez is on the White House's short list. Based on his resumé, Perez, who is now secretary of labor, is a reasonable choice. He's also one of the administration's most stalwart progressives. Before taking charge of the Department of Labor in July 2013, Perez was the assistant attorney general of the Justice Department's civil rights division. The office had been eviscerated under George W. Bush, and Perez revitalized it by mounting voting rights cases and legal challenges to discrimination against gays and lesbians. During his tenure, the division opened a record breaking number of investigations into police abuse and forged wide-ranging agreements to clean up various police forces accused of misconduct, no small matter given recent national debates and controversy sparked by the Ferguson episode and the Trayvon Martin shooting. As *Mother Jones* previously [reported](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/03/tom-perez-justice-department-trayvon-martin" \t "_blank): Using its authority to compel institutional changes in local law enforcement agencies that have engaged in systemic violations of Americans' constitutional rights, Perez's office has helped to overhaul the police department of Puerto Rico and New Orleans police force. (New Orleans police officers shot several civilians in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.) It has scrutinized the Miami and Seattle police departments and exposed the civil rights abuses of Arizona's notorious anti-immigrant Sheriff Joe Arpaio. Perez has long demonstrated a commitment to civil rights and a robust role for government. As a federal prosecutor during George H.W. Bush's administration, he won notable convictions of several neo-Nazis who had committed a string of murders designed to spark a race war. He later worked for Sen. Ted Kennedy before being elected to the Montgomery County council in Maryland and joining the board of an immigration rights group. Since the financial meltdown, the Justice Department has faced criticism that it did not prosecute the Wall Streeters most responsible for triggering the catastrophic recession that hit in 2008. That wasn't Perez's call. But as chief of the civil rights division, he did target[ed] big banks by bringing enforcement actions against financial institutions for racial discrimination and for foreclosing on active-duty military service-members in violation of federal law. He created a fair lending unit within the division that went on to w[o]n a $335 million settlement against Bank of America and a $175 million settlement against Wells Fargo. These were the two largest fair-housing settlements in Justice Department history. After being promoted to run the Labor Department, Perez also fired up that bureaucracy. As Politico recently [noted](http://www.politico.com/story/2014/10/tom-perez-labor-112241.html" \t "_blank), It was one of the federal government's sleepier outposts for most of the dozen years that preceded Perez's arrival just over one year ago. But Labor has been newly energized under Perez. "Enforcement activity is up," Alfred Robinson Jr., who was an acting wage and hour administrator for the Labor Department during the George W. Bush administration, noted earlier this month in a blog post. The department has also raised its public profile on issues like minimum wage and paid medical leave and lavished favorable attention on companies that give employees what Perez calls "voice." So the guy has the legal, policy, and management chops to be attorney general. And if Obama nominated him, the president would send a resounding message that he remained committed to a progressive agenda. Now for the politics: Perez is the son of exiled Dominican immigrants.

It’s not just about economic prosperity, but ensuring workers have a voice. **NBC quotes Perez**[[10]](#footnote-10)**:**

You speak often about the middle class, but frankly, it’s not all that clear what the middle class means now. At one time, we were talking about access to education, a stable job that made it possible to buy a home. Things like the GI bill, union salaries, and pensions secured the middle class, but increasingly, [these things are relics](http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/in-plain-sight/two-americas-many-brace-have-not-holiday-season-n238536). When you talk about the middle class, what are you talking about? Perez: The middle class is a timeless concept that is as much a values set as it is a number that denotes median family income. The values part is about people who have the capacity to have a home, retirement, healthcare and employment security. It’s the ability for people to help their children do a little better than they did. That’s the moral contract, and that’s what makes us the greatest country on earth. The challenge out of the Great Recession is to ensure that we continue to maintain this social compact with America. And we must continue to strive to ensure that we have shared prosperity. We see encouraging job growth, and we’re on pace to have more; the challenge is to make sure that the rising tide lifts all boats and not simply the yachts. There is an argument that low wages are a product of globalization. But low wages are a choice, not a necessity. In every business model across America I can give you examples of employers that reject the false choice between the shareholder, worker, and customer. NBC: Yet because the minimum wage remains at an historic low in terms of buying power, many employers are making the opposite choice: to cut worker pay and impose difficult scheduling policies to grow profits. Among the workers at the bottom of the scale are [tipped workers](http://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/minimum-wage-fight-turns-tips-n153046) who are entitled to just $2.13 per hour under federal minimum wages law. So, what percent do you tip? And how much are we supposed to tip, say, at a coffee shop when you buy a $1.85 cup of coffee. What does the Secretary of Labor put in the tip jar for the barista? Perez: Well, I am the wrong guy to ask. I save a lot of money because I don’t drink coffee, because I don’t go to Starbucks. I don’t drink tea either. It’s healthier. Look at me I’m drinking water. It’s interesting: I’ve traveled internationally a fair amount recently, and I always ask what the custom is around tipping. In Spain I was instructed not to tip at all. I bring this up because restaurateurs there say it is their responsibility to pay their workers fairly. That’s not how it works here, and as a result while everyone has monthly overhead—rent utilities and the like—when you’re a tipped worker, you have no guarantee of how much money will come in. That’s colossally unfair. When the government shut down, I’d go into restaurants that were ordinarily packed at lunchtime and they were ghost towns, and those workers relied on tips, but they were not going to get that money back. "It’s understandable that there continues to be angst." All too frequently, while an employer is supposed to compensate them for the difference between $2.13 and the full minimum wage, that does not always happen. That’s why my office has a pretty aggressive enforcement operation going after back wages and penalties for employers who don’t pay. The federal minimum wage is too low to begin with in and the tipped wage results tipped workers, disproportionately women, really taking it on the chin. NBC: Speaking of disproportionality, racial inequality is a persistent feature of the economy—unemployment and underemployment rates are[higher in communities of color](http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/in-plain-sight/dying-out-here-u-s-job-gains-leave-black-women-n202376). How is your department addressing persistent racial inequality in work? Perez: There is not one magic bullet. If there was one magic bullet to increase wages and to ensure shared prosperity that bullet would have been shot. There are many things that we need to do. For one, 70 percent of GDP growth is from consumption, and we need to take actions to stimulate consumption, including but not limited to raising the minimum wage. More broadly, we are dramatically reforming how we upscale America. I was at Lorraine County Community College this morning talking to people who were out of work, surviving on public benefits and have now punched their ticket to the middle class because they got onto the skills super highway that we are constructing. It’s allowed them to get the skills that match them with in demand jobs. When you look at unemployment rates, they’re coming down for all demographics. But at the same time, the African American and Latino unemployment rates were higher, so even though they’re coming down, but they are still unconscionably high. If you look at where it was a year ago, and where it is now, it’s moving in the right direction, but it’s all too slow. For black workers, if you look at incarceration rates of young black men compared to the rest of the population, they are very high. We have done a number of investments, often in partnership with the Department of Justice, to help people coming out of prison, including but not limited to young black men, to have access to the skills they need, and the support systems they need to get access to a job and not recidivate. *"If there was one magic bullet to increase wages ... that bullet would have been shot."* At the same the [Equal Employment Opportunity Commission] has been looking into the use of criminal histories as a filter in the hiring process and whether that implicates Title VII [anti-discrimination laws]. And that’s something that they continue to look at on a case by case basis. The largest private employer in the state of Maryland is [Johns] Hopkins [University]. It is also one of the most prolific employers of former offenders. They are not doing it as an act of charity. They are doing it because they find a great, loyal and productive workforce. NBC: Young workers are also having a tough time in this recovery. Many internships in the U.S. [are unpaid](http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/in-plain-sight/no-one-should-have-work-free-end-unpaid-internship-v20262899), so college and post-college aged people work for free because it’s “good experience.” The Labor Department has[issued guidelines](http://www.propublica.org/article/how-the-labor-department-let-companies-off-hook-for-unpaid-internships) saying an intern can be unpaid if they’re doing work that furthers their education and that a paid employee wouldn’t do otherwise. Yet recent reporting has shown that the DOL has not prioritized enforcement of internship laws. Perez: We do have an active [enforcement] focus on the individual cases of folks who should be classified as employees but are treated as interns and we’ll continue to do that, but at the same time if your focus is entirely on strategies to use enforcement to make sure that you get people into the workforce to make money, I think at best we’ll see fleeting progress. So we’re looking to alternatives. I was in the U.K. and Germany and went to Volkswagen and learned about their apprenticeship model—young people become paid apprentices in trades. It’s not a coincidence that youth unemployment is far lower in Germany than the United States because there are paid opportunities for young people to get experience. So, yes we need to and do investigate [internship violations], but I think the broader solution will help more people faster to transform the culture of America around this earn-while-you-learn idea. *"It’s not a coincidence that youth unemployment is far lower in Germany."* We’re going to do a $100 million competitive grant to help develop apprenticeship models in the U.S. I expect that a typical recipient will be a partnership that will include business, non-profits and educators that will not be focused only on skilled trades, but also in emerging areas like healthcare, cyber security, IT. I expect that these grants will help get minorities and women into apprenticeships. NBC: [I wrote a story](http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/in-plain-sight/whats-making-these-selma-alabama-auto-parts-workers-so-sick-n150136) about workers in a foam plant in Selma, Alabama, that that sells cushions to Hyundai. Workers say that chemicals in the plant are making them sick, and they want to hold their employer accountable, but they say it’s not entirely clear if they should complain to Hyundai or the contractor that employs them directly. Subcontracting like this has reshaped the American labor market, and for workers, that can be a tremendous challenge. Perez: You’re talking about the fissured workplace. When we talk about the challenges of shared prosperity, the fissured workplace poses a challenge to shared prosperity. The fissured workplace has different forms—there are workers that act like and quack like employees but are called contract workers. There are business models that contract out essential services, like in your story. In your story, you wrote about Denise Barnett [a worker at the Alabama plant]. What she’s dealing with, I see that all the time: accountability becomes and feels unclear. If we are going to build shared prosperity in society and address wage challenges that you and I have discussed, we need to make sure we treat people as employees. We need to make sure that workers have voice. When you don’t have voice, [employees] BRACKETS IN ORIGINAL feel much more vulnerable.

Martin Luther King Jr. is a pioneering figure in race relations, winning a Nobel Prize and studying the example of Indian freedom fighters like Gandhi. His work directly led to the passage of the civil rights act. King is clear on the importance of establishing a living wage. **KING:**[[11]](#footnote-11) We know of no more crucial civil rights issue facing Congress today than the need to increase the federal minimum wage and extend its coverage. We believe it is imperative that farm laborers, among the most abused and neglected of all American workers, be included at last among those who benefit from the Fair Labor Standards Act. We want coverage extended to include those millions in retail trades, laundries, hospitals and nursing homes, restaurants, hotels, small logging operations and cotton gins who still work for starvation wages. While we are mindful of the shocking fact that less than one-half of all non-white workers are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, we do not speak for Negro workers only. A living wage should be the right of all working Americans, and this is what we wish to urge upon our Congressmen and Senators as they now prepare to deal with this legislation.

Also worshipping the will is incoherent. **CHESTERTON[[12]](#footnote-12):** "The worship of will is the negation of will. **To admire mere choice is to refuse to choose**. If Mr. Bernard Shaw comes up to me and says, "**Will something**," that **is tantamount to saying**, "**I do not mind what you will**," and that is **tantamount to saying, "I have no will in the matter**." **You cannot admire will in general, because the essence of will is that it is particular.** A brilliant anarchist like Mr. John Davidson feels an irritation against ordinary morality, and therefore he invokes will—will to anything. He only wants humanity to want something. But **humanity does want something. It wants ordinary morality. [They] rebel against the law and tells us to will something or anything. But we have willed something. We have willed the law against which [they] rebel.**

Dube et al.’s study which is the most robust and generalizable proves restaurants solve poverty w/o unemployment. **SCHMITT[[13]](#footnote-13):** Probably **the most important** and influential **paper** written on the minimum wage in the last decade **was Dube**, Lester, and Reich (2010)'s study,21 **which offered a comprehensive reappraisal of** both the new **minimum wage research** and its critics. The study was **built around a** key **methodological innovation**, which essentially generalized Card and Krueger's New Jersey study **to make it nationally representative**, and **identified a** significant **weakness in much of the earlier** minimum-wage **research** based on the analysis of state employment patterns, **which had failed to control for regional differences in employment growth** that were **unrelated to the minimum wage**. The most convincing critique of Card and Krueger's (1994, 2000) study of the increase in the New Jersey minimum wage (relative to Pennsylvania, where the minimum wage did not go up) was that it is difficult to generalize from a single case study. Even a perfect experiment will have random error that could affect the results in a single experiment. Imagine that the minimum wage had a small, but real, negative employment effect. Random errors will lead the results of separate tests to be distributed around this hypothetical negative employment effect, sometimes producing a larger disemployment effect than the "true" level, sometimes producing a smaller disemployment effect than what is "true" – even zero or positive measured disemployment effects. By this thinking, Card and Krueger's experiment could have been perfectly executed, but still represent only one result from a distribution of possible outcomes. Absent other information, the best estimate of the true effect of the minimum wage would be Card and Krueger's actual results, but we cannot convincingly rule out, based on that single case, that the effects were in truth larger or smaller than what was observed in the case of New Jersey in 1992. In recognition of this problem, Dube, Lester and Reich (2010) essentially replicated Card and Krueger's New Jersey-Pennsylvania experiment thousands of times, by comparing employment differences across contiguous U.S. counties with different levels of the minimum wage. **The three economists carefully constructed a data set of restaurant employment in every quarter between 1990 and 2006 in the 1,381 counties in the United States** for which data were available continuously over the full period.22 They also matched these employment data with the level of the federal or state minimum wage (whichever was higher) in the county in each quarter of each year in the sample. **They then compared restaurant employment outcomes across a subset of 318 pairs of** bordering **counties** where the prevailing minimum wage could differ, depending on the level of the federal and state minimum wage. Their methodology effectively generalizes the Card and Krueger New Jersey-Pennsylvania study, but with several advantages. **First, the much larger number of cases allowed Dube**, Lester, and Reich **to look at a much larger distribution of employment outcomes** than was possible in the single case of the 1992 increase in the New Jersey minimum wage. **Second**, since **they followed counties over a 16-year period**, the researchers were also **able to test for** the possibility of **longer-term effects.** Finally, because the relative minimum wage varied across counties over time, the minimum wage in a particular county could, at different points in time, be lower, identical to, and higher than the minimum wage in its pair, providing substantially more experimental variation than in the New Jersey-Pennsylvania (and many similar) studies. Using this large sample of border counties, and these statistical advantages over earlier research, **Dube**, Lester, and Reich "...**find strong earnings effects and no employment effects of minimum wage increases.**

Helen Keller was an incredible person who inspired many. **DRYJANSKI:**[[14]](#footnote-14) Helen was important to other people with disabilities because she inspired people. She showed that Deaf and blind people deserved respect.  She helped support various Deaf-Blind programs. Helen inspired people with disabilities because she was persistent. One way she showed persistence was when she applied to college. Another way was when she learned letters, words, and sentences. Anne kept showing her more letters, words, and sentences and Helen kept wanting to learn more and more.  Helen showed that it doesn’t matter if person has a disability. She showed that if a person works hard and has persistence, that person can make it. She founded an organization in 1915, "Helen Keller International;" which was dedicated to preventing blindness and teaching people how to live well. The organization printed books and music in braille and these books helped blind people so they could understand and learn new things.  Helen Keller inspired everyone. Some people thought she wouldn't be able to do anything like normal people do. Despite her disabilities, she was exactly like normal person but only just deaf-blind.

She is clear that living wages are good. **KELLER**[[15]](#footnote-15)**:** As civilization has grown more complex the workers have become more and more enslaved, until today they are little more than parts of the machines they operate. Daily they face the dangers of railroad, bridge, skyscraper, freight train, stokehold, stockyard, lumber raft and min. Panting and training at the docks, on the railroads and underground and on the seas, they move the traffic and pass from land to land the precious commodities that make it possible for us to live. And what is their reward? A scanty wage, often poverty, rents, taxes, tributes and war indemnities. The kind of preparedness the workers want is reorganization and reconstruction of their whole life, such as has never been attempted by statesmen or governments. The Germans found out years ago that they could not raise good soldiers in the slums so they abolished the slums. They saw to it that all the people had at least a few of the essentials of civilization--decent lodging, clean streets, wholesome if scanty food, proper medical care and proper safeguards for the workers in their occupations. That is only a small part of what should be done, but what wonders that one step toward the right sort of preparedness has wrought for Germany! For eighteen months it has kept itself free from invasion while carrying on an extended war of conquest, and its armies are still pressing on with unabated vigor. It is your business to force these reforms on the Administration. Let there be no more talk about what a government can or cannot do. All these things have been done by all the belligerent nations in the hurly-burly of war. Every fundamental industry has been managed better by the governments than by private corporations. It is your duty to insist upon still more radical measure. It is your business to see that no child is employed in an industrial establishment or mine or store, and that no worker in needlessly exposed to accident or disease. It is your business to make them give you clean cities, free from smoke, dirt and congestion. It is your business to make them pay you a living wage. It is your business to see that this kind of preparedness is carried into every department on the nation, until everyone has a chance to be well born, well nourished, rightly educated, intelligent and serviceable to the country at all times. Strike against all ordinances and laws and institutions that continue the slaughter of peace and the butcheries of war. Srike against war, for without you no battles can be fought. Strike against manufacturing scrapnel and gas bombs and all other tools of murder. Strike against preparedness that means death and misery to millions of human being. Be not dumb, obedient slaves in an army of destruction. Be heroes in an army of construction.

underview 2:

Woman and racial minorities in the restaurant industry suffer even more with a lack of sufficient wages. **ECONOMIC POLICY INSTITUTE[[16]](#footnote-16):** Occupations within the restaurant industry are highly gendered and have strong racial and ethnic concentrations. Women are much more likely than men to be cashiers/counter attendants, hosts, and wait staff and make less than men in every restaurant occupation except for dining room attendants/bartender helpers, where they make roughly the same. Blacks are disproportionately likely to be cashiers/counter attendants, the lowest-paid occupation in the industry. Hispanics are disproportionately likely to be dishwashers, dining room attendants, or cooks, also relatively low-paid occupations. White non-Hispanics are disproportionately likely to be hosts/hostesses, wait staff, bartenders, or managers, which are among the industry’s more highly paid occupations. More than two in five restaurant workers, or 43.1 percent, live below twice the poverty line—more than twice the 19.9 percent share outside the restaurant industry. (Twice the official poverty threshold is commonly used by researchers as a measure of what it takes for a family to make ends meet.) Non-naturalized immigrants in the restaurant industry are the most likely to be poor or near-poor, with 59.3 percent living below twice the poverty line. Blacks and Hispanics within the restaurant industry are also very likely to be poor or near-poor, with 55.6 percent and 56.5 percent living below twice the poverty line, respectively. 45.9 percent of women who work in restaurants live below twice the poverty line, compared with 40.0 percent of men.

A living wage for tipped workers is necessary to promote racial and gender equality among a largely minority based working class. **CHEN[[17]](#footnote-17):** Providing tipped service workers a reasonable base wage is a matter of gender and racial equality and basic dignity. About 40 percent of tipped workers are people of color, and about two-thirds are women. About 30 percent are parents, many of them single moms.

Moral nihilism does not provide reason to act, which means you err toward any risk of an ethical mandate. **SINNOT-ARMSTRONG[[18]](#footnote-18):** A different kind of ‘‘idleness’’ is charged when critics claim that belief in moral nihilism does not give people any reason to act differently. This is obvious, in one way, since the point of moral nihilism is to deny moral reasons, not to assert or add any new reasons. Nonetheless, belief in moral nihilism might affect what people have adequate reason to do, if it undermines moral reasons to do or not to do certain acts. Of course, moral nihilists still might have other, non-moral reasons to do exactly what non-nihilists think they have moral reasons to do. How- ever, it is hard to see why moral and non-moral reasons must always coincide in this way.

Policing discourse is bad for achieving a good outcome. It prevents people from making necessary declarations until we feel that we know how to talk about an issue correctly, so we are unwilling to call out injustice and figure I will let someone else who knows how to call it out properly say it, but putting off making important judgments about the intolerability of something is intolerable.

answers to k – specific to this version:

1. Wood 1 turns K by arguing that intellectual virtues broader the mind and civilize exchanges so we are more accepting of other people's ideas.

2. The analytic before Gadamer 1 explains why is incoherent to reject the aff because it does not have the right method which will answer a lot of Ks. We cannot wait till we have the right ethical methodology to start ethical reasoning, otherwise we could not even be confident that studying ethics is ethical. Instead we must recognize our own historicity and thus the rational authority of those better situated in the development of moral understand.

3. Wood 1 can also be leveraged on ROB debates because it specifically talks about how the role of educational activities should be to inculcate intellectual virtues first that would obviously outweigh their ROB, because though inculcating these virtues we can better assess (whatever there ROB is) that can also be leveraged as an answer to theory.
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